

REMARKS

The Official Action of July 6, 2004, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-5 and 7-11, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 6 and 12 have been canceled. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 remain in the application for consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 1-3 and 9-11 are allowed, and claims 6-8 would be allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. Only claims 4, 5 and 12 have been rejected on the basis of prior art.

In response, Applicant has canceled allowable claim 6 and claim 12 and added the features of allowable claim 6 to independent claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is now allowable along with dependent claims 5, 7 and 8 and allowed claims 1-3 and 9-11, and that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.


Appln. No. 10/683,696
Amdt. dated September 14, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2004

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\bn\d\dire\nien31\pto\Amendment-A.doc